



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/798,236

03/11/2004

Abhay Sharma

U 015074-0

3561

Ladas & Parry  
26 West 61 Street  
New York, NY 10023

7590

04/17/2009

EXAMINER

PERREIRA, MELISSA JEAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/17/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/798,236	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SHARMA, ABHAY	
	<b>Examiner</b> MELISSA PERREIRA	<b>Art Unit</b> 1618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/23/09 has been entered.

### ***Previous Claims and Rejections Status***

2. Claims 11-13 are pending in the application.
3. The rejection of claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 6,541,193B2) in view of Wolf et al. (*J. Neuroscience* **2002**, 22, 11035-11044) and Faeldt et al. (US 2004/0076583A1) and further in view of Saba et al. (US 2003/0219782A1) is maintained.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1618

5. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 6,541,193B2) in view of Saba et al. (US 2003/0219782A1) and further in view of Wolf et al. (*J. Neuroscience* **2002**, 22, 11035-11044) and Faeldt et al. (US 2004/0076583A1).

6. Sharma et al. (US 6,541,193B2) discloses the method for screening of neuroactive drugs using the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster* (abstract; column 1, lines 62-64) by culturing the flies in medium under standard conditions (column 2, lines 19-20; column 3, example 1) where Sharma et al. envisioned using Oregon-R wild-type flies for the method for screening of neuroactive drugs but used Sh<sup>5</sup>eag<sup>1</sup> mutant flies because they recover from ether anesthesia earlier than wild-type ones (column 2, lines 55-59). The cultured flies are separated into two groups including a first group fed with normal food and a second group fed with food mixed with an agent (phenobarbital sodium) being screened and fed for 5 days which encompasses about seven days of the instant claims (column 2, lines 23-26; column 3, example 1, especially lines 50-53). The method involves comparing flies treated with normal fly food mixed with the agent (to be screened) to flies fed on normal fly food not containing the agent (column 2, lines 23-42). In one embodiment, a blind screening of plant extracts was examine via mixing the extracts with the standard fly medium (culturing medium) in vials and transferring flies to the extract containing medium (column 4, lines 39-49). The locomotor activities of the flies fed with regular food are compared to the locomotor activities of the flies fed with food mixed with an agent where the increased locomotor activity is indicative of a psychostimulant activity of the agent (column 2, lines 39+; column 5, lines 1-10; claim

Art Unit: 1618

4). Sharma et al. does not disclose the step of culturing the flies in media containing a neuroactive drug. Sharma et al. also does not disclose identifying the specific locomotor activities of the instant claims or the step of measuring horizontal and vertical locomotor activities after shifting the flies to drug free media for 30 days.

7. Saba et al. (US 2003/0219782A1) discloses culturing *Drosophila melanogaster* in the absence or presence of a candidate agent under conditions and for a time sufficient to observe in the *Drosophila melanogaster* an effect of the agent (p2, [0018]).

8. Faeldt et al. (US 2004/0076583A1) discloses the method of screening for the effects of a test agent on a population of *Drosophila melanogaster* (including wild-type) to monitor one or more traits (i.e. locomotor activity) of the test agent, such as pilocarpine, etc. (p3, [0041-0042]; p4, [0057]; p7, [0073-0076]). Two groups or more, including a first group that are administered a test agent and a second reference group, are examined and compared for their locomotor activity (p4, [0050-0053]). The population of flies are acutely or chronically contacted with a test agent (p19, [0249]) and locomotor activity may be examined at a plurality of times during the life of the fly which encompasses measuring the various locomotor activities in flies contacted with a test agent after they have been removed from the drug containing media of the instant claim 10 (p2, [0010]; p20, [0255-0256]). The traits/locomotor activities are measured by detecting the movement of a population of flies in containers, such as in a horizontal and vertical direction (p3, [0045]; p7, [0079]-[0088]; p8, [0104]).

9. Wolf et al. (*J. Neuroscience* **2002**, 22, 11035-11044) discloses the analysis of the locomotor activity in *Drosophila* (p11035, paragraph 3). The examination of the

Art Unit: 1618

locomotor activity, via walking speed (fig 2) consists of alternating the exposure of air and ethanol to the flies. The flies become immobile upon overexposure to ethanol but recover when a stream of air replaces the ethanol and the hyperactive phase caused by the smell of the ethanol is attributable to internal accumulation of ethanol affecting nervous system function is indicative of neural plasticity (p11037, paragraph 1).

10. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to culture flies in medium containing the drug in light of the disclosure of Saba et al., which teaches culturing *Drosophila melanogaster* in the absence or presence of a candidate agent, and in combination with the blind screen test of Sharma et al. which discloses that the plant extracts were mixed with the standard fly medium (culturing medium). Therefore it is predictable that a culturing medium containing a drug is available for the culturing of flies.

11. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to screen neuroactive drugs by monitoring the locomotor activities of wild-type *Drosophila melanogaster* as Faeldt et al. teaches the use of wild type animals for the method of screening for the effects of a test agent and Sharma et al. envisioned the use of wild-type flies for the method of screening for the effects of a test agent. It would also have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to measure the neural plasticity resulting from the administration of a neuroactive drug for the method for screening of neuroactive drugs of Sharma et al. as Wolf et al. describes the method of administering a psychoactive drug (ethanol) to flies, monitoring the recovery from such administration, monitoring locomotor activities and thus measuring the neural plasticity. One would

Art Unit: 1618

have a reasonable expectation of success for monitoring the neural plasticity induced by the (any) neuroactive drug once the flies have been removed from media containing a neuroactive drug since Faeldt et al. teaches that the locomotor activity may be examined at a plurality of times during the life of the fly which encompasses measuring the various locomotor activities in flies contacted with a test agent after they have been removed from the drug containing media (Faeldt et al. p2, [0010]; p20, [0255-0256]).

### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments filed 2/23/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

13. Applicant asserts that Faeldt et al. does not disclose nor suggest withdrawal from the drug for 30 days or measurement after withdrawal from chronic exposure of a drug. Applicant asserts that the average life span of a female fly is 26 days and of a male is 33 days and mutant flies generally have a shorter life span. Therefore the fact that the mutant flies were used and the exposure to the drug correlates to the life span of the flies so that measurements could not have been taken after withdrawal of the drug.

14. An average life span of the flies is 33 days and thus indicates that a portion of the male flies have a life span greater than 33 days. Sharma et al. teaches of feeding the flies for 5 days with normal fly food mixed with the agent while Faeldt et al. teaches of chronically contacting a population of flies (i.e. wild-type) with a test agent many times and that the locomotor activity may be examined at a plurality of times during the life of the fly (Faeldt et al. p19, [0249]). The application of the test agent many times to the

Art Unit: 1618

population of flies, removing the flies from the drug containing media and measuring the various locomotor activities of the flies at a plurality of times encompasses contacting the flies with a test agent and measuring the locomotor activities of the flies after removing the flies from the drug containing media, respectively. In combination, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to feed flies (not excluding male wild-type) with a test agent for 5 days and then measure the various locomotor activities at a plurality of times during the life of the fly (not excluding 30 days after removal of the test agent) with the expectation of success that a portion of the male flies will live at least 30 more days after 5 days of exposure to the test agent, for a total of 35 days.

### ***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed at this time.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELISSA PERREIRA whose telephone number is (571)272-1354. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Hartley can be reached on 571-272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 1618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael G. Hartley/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618

/Melissa Perreira/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1618